

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-14 are pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 9 are independent claims.

Claim Objections

The objections to claims 1-8 have been corrected. Specifically, in claim 1, lines 8-9, the phrase, "the photographing signal processing" has been amended to read, ---the predetermined photographing signal processing---; and on line 11, the phrase, "the photographing signal processing unit" has been amended to read, ---the photographing signal processing units--- without substantive change in claim scope.

In claim 10, line 4, the phrase, "the recording media" has been amended to read, ---a recording media---.

In claim 11, lines 2-3, the phrase, "predetermined analog signal processing" has been amended to read, ---the predetermined analog signal processing---; and on lines 5-6, the phrase, "the CCD image sensor. Thereafter the analog image signal" has been amended to read, ---the CCD image sensor; thereafter the analog image signal---.

In claim 12, line 2, the phrase, "the predetermined plurality of processors" has been amended to read, ---the plurality of processors---.

Applicant respectfully submits that, as amended, the objections to these claims have been overcome. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of these objections is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 9-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kitajima* (U.S. Patent 7,184,077) in view of *Morinaka et al.* (U.S. Patent 7,148,926).

Independent claim 9 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of dependent claim 14, which was objected to by the Examiner as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Thus, Applicant submits that independent claim 9 should now be allowable. Dependent claims 10-13 should also be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on an allowable base claim.

Objection To Claim

Claim 14 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. All the limitations of claim 14 have been incorporated into independent claim 9. According, Applicant submits that claim 9 should now be allowable. Claim 14 has been canceled.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant appreciates the indication of allowable subject matter on claim 1-8. The objections to claims 1-8 in the Office Action have been corrected by amendment as indicated above. Independent claim 9, as amended, incorporates all the limitations of objected claim 14. Thus, independent claim 9 should now be allowable. Dependent claims 10-13 depend on allowable independent claim 9; therefore, they should also be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency to claim 9. Accordingly, Applicant believes all pending claims 1-13 are now allowable.

CONCLUSION

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but to merely show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the outstanding rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance in the present application.

However, should the Examiner believe that any outstanding matters remain in the present application, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' representative, Michael K. Mutter (Reg. No. 29,680) at the telephone number of the undersigned in order to discuss the application and expedite prosecution.

Dated: August 30, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael K. Mutter

Registration No.: 29,680

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Rd

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

Attachments: